

**MAY 18 2006**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

DARRYL J. QUARLES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM  
CORPORATION, a corporation; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 06-55120

D.C. No. CV-05-08843-FMC

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Florence Marie Cooper, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 15, 2006 <sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: B. FLETCHER, TROTT, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

This preliminary injunction appeal comes to us for review under Ninth Circuit Rule 3-3. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2). Accordingly, appellant's request for oral argument is denied.

We subject a district court's order regarding preliminary injunctive relief to only limited review. *Walczak v. EPL Prolong, Inc.*, 198 F.3d 725, 730 (9th Cir. 1999). Our review of an order regarding a preliminary injunction "is much more limited than review of an order involving a permanent injunction, where all conclusions of law are freely reviewable." *Id.* A decision regarding a preliminary injunction is reviewed for abuse of discretion, which occurs only if the district court based its decision on either an erroneous legal standard or clearly erroneous factual findings. *Id.*

The district court did not abuse its discretion here. *See Martin v. International Olympic Comm.*, 740 F.2d 670, 674-75 (9th Cir. 1984). We therefore affirm the district court's order denying plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.

**AFFIRMED.**